

The Volume of the Intersection of a Convex Body with its Translates

M. Meyer
Equipe d'Analyse
Université Paris VI
F-75252-Paris, Cedex 05
France

S. Reisner
Department of Mathematics
and
School of Education of the Kibbutz Movement-Oranim
University of Haifa
Haifa, 31905
Israel

M. Schmuckenschläger*	
Institut für Mathematik	Department of Theoretical
Johannes Kepler	Mathematics
Universität	and Weizmann Institute of
Linz	Science
Austria	Rehovot, 76100
	Israel

*supported by Erwin Schrödinger Stipendium J0630

Abstract

It is proved that for a symmetric convex body K in $\mathbf{R}^n$, if for some $\tau > 0$, $|K \cap (x + \tau K)|$ depends on $\|x\|_K$ only, then K is an ellipsoid. As a part of the proof, smoothness properties of convolution bodies are studied.

1 Introduction and statement of the main result

Let K be a symmetric convex body in $\mathbf{R}^n$ (i.e. K is a compact, convex set in $\mathbf{R}^n$ with non-empty interior, *symmetric* means in this paper: centrally symmetric about the origin-0, unless another center of symmetry is explicitly specified). We denote the norm (Minkowski-functional) which is defined by K by $\|\cdot\|_K : \|x\|_K = \inf\{\lambda > 0; x \in \lambda K\}$.

We solve the following problem: What can be said about a symmetric convex body K which has the property that $F(x) = |K \cap (x + K)|$ as a function of $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$, depends on $\|x\|_K$ alone? ($|A|$ denotes the k -dimensional Lebesgue measure of a set A , where k is the dimension of the minimal flat containing A).

Actually, one could formulate a more general problem, using $\|x\|_L$ where L is another symmetric convex body. It is, however, easy to check, which we do in the sequel, that the property formulated above, with $\|x\|_L$ instead of $\|x\|_K$ implies that $\|x\|_L = \alpha \|x\|_K$, i.e. L and K are homothetic with center-0.

We prove in this paper that the only convex bodies having the above property are ellipsoids.

The motivation for dealing with this kind of problems was to check to what extent the following conjecture of Thue-Poulsen [TP], Kneser [K] and Hadwiger [H] can be generalized. The conjecture (generalized to $\mathbf{R}^n$) is the following: Let $\{B_1, \dots, B_k\}$, $\{B'_1, \dots, B'_k\}$ be two collections of Euclidean balls of the same radius in $\mathbf{R}^n$. Let x_i, x'_i be the centers of B_i, B'_i respectively and assume that $|x_i - x_j| \leq |x'_i - x'_j|$ for all i and j ($|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm). Then

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^k B_i \right| \leq \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^k B'_i \right|$$

(cf. [B], [Gr], [C-P] and [Go] for solutions in special cases and related results).

From our result it follows that the above conjecture can be formulated only about Euclidean balls (or, which is the same, translates of an ellipsoid, together with the distance function defined by this ellipsoid).

Actually the exact formulation of the result is stronger than the one stated above (cf. Theorem 1.1).

There are two main tools in the proof: one is a volumic formula for the Gauss–Kronecker curvature of the boundary of a convex body, versions of which were proved by Leichtweiss [L] and Schmuckenschläger [S-m] and which is extended here. From this formula and the volume-of-intersection property assumed here, one gets a differential equation which can be transformed into an equation of Monge–Ampère type and which was discussed by Petty [P]. Petty’s result is the second tool in the proof.

In order to obtain the result using the equation mentioned above, we had to prove sufficient smoothness of K . For this sake we prove some results, which are of independent interest, concerning smoothness properties of *convolution bodies*. The above name was given in [S-m] but such bodies were defined and used before (cf. [M], [B-L]).

Let K be a convex body in $\mathbf{R}^n$ with $0 \in \text{int } K$ and $\tau > 0$. For $0 < \delta < \min(1, \tau^n)$ we set

$$K(\delta, \tau) = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n; |K \cap (x + \tau K)| \geq \delta\}$$

If $\tau = 1$ we set $K(\delta) = K(\delta, 1)$. We call $K(\delta, \tau)$ –the *convolution body* of K with parameters δ and τ (this is a deviation from the definition in [S-m]). By Brunn–Minkowski theorem, $K(\delta, \tau)$ is a convex body, moreover, it is symmetric if K is.

The structure of the paper is as follows: In the next parts of this introduction we give some notations and formulate the main theorem—Theorem 1.1. Then we bring a simple observation. Section 2 is devoted to proving smoothness properties of convolution bodies. In Section 3 we prove an extended volumic formula for the Gauss–Kronecker curvature of the boundary of a convex body. In Section 4 we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 and conclude with some remarks and problems.

The notations we use are standard. The standard scalar product in $\mathbf{R}^n$ is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, the Euclidean unit sphere in $\mathbf{R}^n$ is S^{n-1} . If K is a convex

body in $\mathbf{R}^n$, $\text{int } K$ is the interior of K and ∂K its boundary. If $0 \in \text{int } K$ we denote by K^* the polar body of K with respect to 0 :

$$K^* = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n; \forall y \in K, \langle x, y \rangle \leq 1\}.$$

For a set $A \subset \mathbf{R}^n$, $\text{span } A$ denotes the linear span of A and

$$A^\perp = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n; \forall y \in A, \langle x, y \rangle = 0\}.$$

If $0 \neq x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ we denote by P_x the orthogonal projection onto $\{x\}^\perp$.

Theorem 1.1 *Let K be a symmetric convex body in $\mathbf{R}^n$. If for some $\tau > 0$, $|K \cap (x + \tau K)|$ depends on $\|x\|_K$ only, Then (and only then) K is an ellipsoid.*

For K and L two symmetric convex bodies in $\mathbf{R}^n$ and $\tau > 0$, let $F(x) = |K \cap (x + \tau K)|$.

Observation 1.2 *Let K and L be symmetric convex bodies in $\mathbf{R}^n$. If $F(x)$ depends only on $\|x\|_L$ then L is homothetic to K .*

Proof. Clearly $\{x; F(x) > 0\} = \{x; \|x\|_K < 1 + \tau\}$. Suppose now that K and L are not homothetic. Then there exist x, y such that $\|x\|_L = \|y\|_L = 1$ and $\|x\|_K = a > b = \|y\|_K$. Let $x' = ((1 + \tau)/a)x$, $y' = ((1 + \tau)/a)y$. Then $\|x'\|_K = 1 + \tau > \|y'\|_K$. It follows that $F(x') = 0 < F(y')$. But this contradicts the fact that $\|x'\|_L = \|y'\|_L = (1 + \tau)/a$. ■

2 Smoothness of Convolution–Bodies

The results of this section are needed for the proof of Theorem 1.1. But some of them are interesting independently of it.

Analogous results concerning strict convexity, smoothness and twice differentiability of the boundary of so-called *floating bodies*, were proved in [M-R-2].

Lemma 2.1 *Let K_1 and K_2 be two convex bodies in $\mathbf{R}^n$ and $u \in S^{n-1}$. For $y \in P_u K_i$ $i = 1, 2$, denote:*

$$\phi_i^+(y) = \max\{t; tu + y \in K_i\}$$

$$\phi_i^-(y) = \min\{t; tu + y \in K_i\}$$

$$f(r) = |K_1 \cap (ru + K_2)|$$

Then we have:

$$f'_+(0) = |C_u^+(1, 2)| - |C_u^-(2, 1)|$$

$$f'_-(0) = |C_u^-(1, 2)| - |C_u^+(2, 1)|$$

where

$$C_u^+(1, 2) = P_u(K_1 \cap K_2) \cap \{\phi_1^+ > \phi_2^+ \geq \phi_1^- > \phi_2^-\}$$

$$C_u^-(1, 2) = P_u(K_1 \cap K_2) \cap \{\phi_1^+ \geq \phi_2^+ > \phi_1^- \geq \phi_2^-\}$$

and $C_u^\pm(2, 1)$ are defined analogously.

Proof. For $y \in P_u(K_1 \cap K_2)$ compute the limit at y , as r tends to 0 from above, of

$$\begin{aligned} (1/r) \{ & [\min(\phi_1^+, \phi_2^+ + r) - \max(\phi_1^-, \phi_2^- + r)]_+ \\ & - [\min(\phi_1^+, \phi_2^+) - \max(\phi_1^-, \phi_2^-)]_+ \} \end{aligned}$$

and integrate using Lebesgue theorem. ■

We bring now a proposition and a lemma. For the purpose of proving Theorem 1.1 Lemma 2.3 would suffice. Proposition 2.2 supplies, however, interesting information about convolution bodies in the case $\tau = 1$, which is not true in general in the case $\tau \neq 1$.

Proposition 2.2 *Let K be a symmetric convex body in $\mathbf{R}^n$ and $0 < \delta < |K|$. Then the convolution body $K(\delta)$ is strictly convex.*

Proof. Assume $x_0 \neq x_1$, $x_0, x_1 \in K$, $x_t = x_0 + t(x_1 - x_0)$ and $F(2x_t) = \text{const.}$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$ ($F(x) = |K \cap (x + K)|$).

Since $\{K_t = K \cap (2x_t + K)\}$ is a concave family, we conclude by the equality case in Brunn–Minkowski inequality and by symmetry with respect to x_t of K_t , that

$$K_t - x_t = K_0 - x_0$$

Hence we get with $v = x_1 - x_0$

$$K \supset K_0 + [0, v] \quad \text{and} \quad K \supset K_1 + [0, v]$$

Therefore

$$[(K_0 + [0, v]) \setminus K_0] \cap \text{int}(2x_0 + K) = \emptyset$$

and

$$[(K_1 + [0, -v]) \setminus K_1] \cap \text{int}(2x_1 + K) = \emptyset$$

It is easy to show that this implies

$$[(K_0 + \mathbf{R}_0^+ v) \setminus K_0] \cap \text{int}(2x_0 + K) = \emptyset$$

$$[(K_1 + \mathbf{R}_0^+ v) \setminus K_1] \cap \text{int}(2x_1 + K) = \emptyset$$

Since K_0 is symmetric with respect to x_0 we have

$$2x_0 + K \supset -K_0 - [0, v] + 2x_0 = K_0 - [0, v]$$

and therefore

$$[(K_0 - \mathbf{R}_0^+ v) \setminus K_0] \cap \text{int } K = \emptyset$$

and

$$[(K_1 - \mathbf{R}_0^+ v) \setminus K_1] \cap \text{int } K = \emptyset$$

These equations imply

$$(K_0 + \mathbf{R}v) \cap K = K_0 + [0, v] \quad \text{and} \quad (K_0 + \mathbf{R}v) \cap (2x_0 + K) = K_0 - [0, v]$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (K_0 + \mathbf{R}v) \cap (2x_t + K) &= (K_0 + \mathbf{R}v) \cap (K + 2x_0 + 2tv) \\ &= K_0 - [0, v] + 2tv \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$K_{1/2} = K \cap (2x_{1/2} + K) \cap (K_0 + \mathbf{R}v) = K_0 + [0, v]$$

which is impossible. ■

Lemma 2.3 *Let K be a symmetric convex body such that for some $\tau > 0$, $|K \cap (x + \tau K)|$ depends on $\|x\|_K$ only. Then K is strictly convex.*

Proof. We may assume $\tau < 1$. Assume that K is not strictly convex, then there are points $x_0, x_1 \in \partial K$, x_0 an extreme point of K , such that for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, $\|x_\alpha\|_K = 1$ where $x_\alpha = (1 - \alpha)x_0 + \alpha x_1$. By our assumption $|K \cap (x_\alpha + \tau K)|$ is constant. Hence, by the equality case in Brunn–Minkowski inequality, $K \cap (x_\alpha + \tau K)$ is a translate of $K \cap (x_0 + \tau K)$. We show that $K \cap (x_\alpha + \tau K) = \alpha u + K \cap (x_0 + \tau K)$ for α small enough, where $u = x_1 - x_0$.

The point $(1 - \tau)x_0$ is an interior point of K and is an extreme point of $K \cap (x_0 + \tau K)$. We can find an exposed point y of $K \cap (x_0 + \tau K)$, close enough to $(1 - \tau)x_0$ so that $y \in \text{int } K$.

Let v be an outer unit normal vector of $K \cap (x_0 + \tau K)$ at y , such that v is not an outer normal of $K \cap (x_0 + \tau K)$ at any other point. Now, if α is small enough, $y + \alpha u \in \text{int } K$, therefore it is an exposed point of $K \cap (x_\alpha + \tau K)$. v is an outer normal of $K \cap (x_\alpha + \tau K)$ at $y + \alpha u$ and not at any other point. This shows that it is impossible that $K \cap (x_\alpha + \tau K) = w + K \cap (x_0 + \tau K)$ unless $w = \alpha u$ (since v is an outer normal of $w + K \cap (x_0 + \tau K)$ at $y + w$).

Having shown this, it is sufficient to prove the lemma for the case $n = 2$. Suppose the boundary of K is given locally by $\varphi : [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and

$$\varphi(t) = 1 \text{ for } t \geq 0, \quad \varphi(t) < 1 \text{ for } t < 0$$

Obviously for $s > 0$ the equality $\varphi(t - s) = \varphi(t)$ is impossible. ■

Theorem 2.4 *Let K be a convex body in $\mathbf{R}^n$ and $\tau > 0$. If K is strictly convex then for all $0 < \delta < \min(1, \tau^n)|K|$, $\partial K(\delta, \tau)$ is of class $\mathcal{C}^1$ (formula (2) in the following proof gives the partial derivative of $F(x) = |K \cap (x + \tau K)|$).*

Proof. By the implicit function theorem we have to show that $F(x)$ has continuous partial derivatives on $\{x; F(x) > 0\}$.

Let $y \in \partial K$, $z \in \partial(x + \tau K)$, by $N(y)$ and $M(z)$ we denote, respectively, the outer unit normal of K at y and the one of $x + \tau K$ at z . By ν and μ we denote, respectively, the surface measures on ∂K and $\partial(x + \tau K)$. Note that N and M are well defined a.e. ν (resp. μ). Since K is strictly convex, $\partial K \cap \partial(x + \tau K)$ has zero $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure, hence $|C_u^+(i, j)| = |C_u^-(i, j)|$ in the notations of Lemma 2.1. Therefore, for

$x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ Lemma 2.1 can be written in the form

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} F(x) &= \int_{K \cap \partial(x + \tau K)} \langle M(y), e_1 \rangle d\mu(y) \\ &= - \int_{(x + \tau K) \cap \partial K} \langle N(y), e_1 \rangle d\nu(y) \end{aligned}$$

where $\{e_j\}$ are the coordinate vectors. The right hand side equality is obtained by noticing that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} |K \cap (x + \tau K)| = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} |\tau K \cap (-x + K)|.$$

Discontinuity may arise in (2) only in cases where for some x , $\partial K \cap \partial(x + \tau K)$ has positive $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure, by strict convexity, this does not happen, hence $\partial F / \partial x_1$ is continuous on $\{x; F(x) > 0\}$.

From (2) it follows that at $x \in \partial K(\delta, \tau)$, i.e. such that $F(x) = \delta$, the outer normal of $\partial K(\delta, \tau)$ is the well defined unit vector in the direction of

$$(2) \quad \int_{\partial K \cap (x + \tau K)} N(y) d\nu(y)$$

which is easily checked to be a non-zero vector for δ in the specified range. ■

Theorem 2.5 *Let K be a convex body in $\mathbf{R}^n$ and $\tau > 0$. If K is strictly convex and ∂K is of class $\mathcal{C}^1$ then for $0 < \delta < \min(1, \tau^n)|K|$, $\partial K(\delta, \tau)$ is of class $\mathcal{C}^2$ (formulae (4) and (7) in the following proof give the second partial derivatives of $F(x) = |K \cap (x + \tau K)|$).*

Proof. Let us use the notations introduced in the proof of Theorem (2.4). We compute first $\partial^2 F / \partial x_2 \partial x_1$ for $x \neq 0$ with $F(x) > 0$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} F(x + \varepsilon e_2) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} F(x) \right] &= \\ - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left[\int_{\partial K \cap (x + \varepsilon e_2 + \tau K)} \langle N(y), e_1 \rangle d\nu(y) - \int_{\partial K \cap (x + \tau K)} \langle N(y), e_1 \rangle d\nu(y) \right] &= \\ = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\partial K \cap [(x + \tau K) \Delta (x + \varepsilon e_2 + \tau K)]} \theta_\varepsilon(y) \langle N(y), e_1 \rangle d\nu(y) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_\varepsilon(y) &= -1 \quad \text{if } y \in (x + \varepsilon e_2 + \tau K) \setminus (x + \tau K) \\ \theta_\varepsilon(y) &= 1 \quad \text{if } y \in (x + \tau K) \setminus (x + \varepsilon e_2 + \tau K)\end{aligned}$$

We claim that the limit as ε tends to 0 of the last integral is

$$(4) \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_2 \partial x_1} F(x) = - \int_{\partial K \cap \partial(x + \tau K)} \frac{\langle M(y), e_2 \rangle \langle N(y), e_1 \rangle}{[1 - \langle M(y), N(y) \rangle^2]^{1/2}} d\sigma(y)$$

where σ is the $(n-2)$ -dimensional surface measure on $S = \partial K \cap \partial(x + \tau K)$ (which, as remarked in the proof of Theorem 2.4 has zero $(n-1)$ -dimensional measure). We notice that by the $\mathcal{C}^1$ assumption on ∂K , $N(y)$ and $M(y)$ are now well defined and continuous on S . By Stokes theorem or by a ‘reverse translation’ argument like the one in the proof of Theorem 2.4, we see that we can exchange the roles of $M(y)$ and $N(y)$ in (4) and then get an expression which is symmetric in x_1 and x_2 (see (7)).

As K is strictly convex, at each point y of $S = \partial K \cap \partial(x + \tau K)$, $N(y)$ and $M(y)$ are not parallel. It follows that $[1 - \langle M(y), N(y) \rangle^2]^{1/2}$ is bounded away from 0. At every point $y \in S$ we estimate the length $L(y)$ of the 1-dimensional curve $\partial K \cap [y + E(y)]$, where $E(y) = \text{span}\{M(y), N(y)\}$, in its intersection with the set $(x + \tau K) \triangle (x + \varepsilon e_2 + \tau K)$. We claim:

$$(5) \quad L(y) = \frac{\varepsilon |\langle M(y), e_2 \rangle|}{[1 - \langle M(y), N(y) \rangle^2]^{1/2}} + \varepsilon \varphi_y(\varepsilon)$$

where $\varphi_y(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This will be proved later.

For $\eta > 0$ let $S(\eta) = \{y \in S; |\langle M(y), e_2 \rangle| \geq \eta\}$. By compactness, for fixed η and for small enough ε we have for all $y \in S(\eta)$

$$(6) \quad \theta_\varepsilon(z) = -\text{sign } \langle M(y), e_2 \rangle$$

for all $z \in \partial K \cap [(x + \tau K) \triangle (x + \varepsilon e_2 + \tau K)] \cap E(y)$.

The estimate (5) shows that the part of the last integral in (3), taken on the part of $\partial K \cap [(x + \tau K) \triangle (x + \varepsilon e_2 + \tau K)]$ where $|\langle M(y), e_2 \rangle| < \eta$ tends to 0 as $\eta \rightarrow 0$. therefore, we conclude from (6), (5) and (3), as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the formula (4).

The same argument works for differentiation twice with respect to x_1 , so the formula for the second derivatives of F may be written as

$$(7) \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} F(x) =$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial K \cap \partial(x + \tau K)} \frac{\langle M(y), e_j \rangle \langle N(y), e_i \rangle + \langle M(y), e_i \rangle \langle N(y), e_j \rangle}{[1 - \langle M(y), N(y) \rangle^2]^{1/2}} d\sigma(y)$$

$$i, j = 1, \dots, n$$

As the integrand in (7) is continuous and $\partial K \cap \partial(x + \tau K)$ is a compact smooth $(n-2)$ -dimensional manifold which varies continuously, together with its derivatives on the surface ∂K , all this by smoothness and strict convexity of ∂K , we get continuity of the second derivatives.

Finally, to prove the estimate (5) we proceed as follows. Let $\bar{n}$ be a unit vector in $\{N\}^\perp \cap \text{span}\{M, N\}$ (we drop the argument y here), and let $\bar{m}$ be a unit vector in $\{M\}^\perp \cap \text{span}\{\bar{n}, e_2\}$.

The approximation of first degree in ε of $L(y)$ is the length l of the side parallel to $\bar{n}$ of the triangle which is formed by lines parallel to $\bar{n}$, $\bar{m}$ and e_2 and has an edge of length ε in the direction of e_2 . The estimate (5) follows now from an elementary (though somewhat lengthy) trigonometric computation. the degenerate case, where $\bar{m}$ and $\bar{n}$ are parallel to e_2 is similarly shown to give $L(y) = o(\varepsilon)$ (this is of course the case $\langle M, e_2 \rangle = 0$). ■

Remark concerning positive curvature. In [M-R-2] it was proved that the floating body associated with a symmetric convex body K , where K is strictly convex and ∂K is of class $\mathcal{C}^1$, is of class $\mathcal{C}^2$ and has positive Gauss–Kronecker curvature at all points of its boundary (this is not stated explicitly there, but the fact that the quadratic form $I(H, \cdot, \cdot)$ is positive-definite, proved in Corollary 2, means this). It is probable that a similar fact is true for convolution bodies. Using Theorems 2.4 and 2.5 and in particular the formulae (2) and (7) we can prove the following result, the details of whose proof we omit.

Proposition 2.6 *Let K be a convex body in $\mathbf{R}^n$. If ∂K is of class $\mathcal{C}^2$ and has positive Gauss–Kronecker curvature everywhere, then the boundary of $K(\delta)$ has positive Gauss–Kronecker curvature everywhere, for all $0 < \delta < |K|$.*

3 A volumic formula for curvature

In this section we bring a formula for the generalized Gauss–Kronecker curvature of the boundary of a convex body at a point where it exists. we work in a wider generality then what is needed for the proof of Theorem 1.1 (for which one can assume that ∂K is of class $\mathcal{C}^2$).

The terminology and notations of this section may be found e.g. in [S-n] (pp.25–26) or in [L]. In particular, a *normal point* of the boundary of a convex body in $\mathbf{R}^n$, is a point where the Dupin indicatrix of K exists. At a normal point, the Gauss–Kronecker curvature of K exists and it can be defined as the product of the principal curvatures (the reciprocal squares of the semi-axes of the indicatrix) of ∂K at the point x .

The set of points of ∂K which are not normal is of zero $(n-1)$ - dimensional Hausdorff measure.

Let K be a symmetric convex body in $\mathbf{R}^n$, $\tau > 0$ and $x \in \partial K$. assume that the outer normal $N(x)$ of K is well defined at x . For $h > 0$ small enough, denote by x_h the point λx ($\lambda > 0$) such that $K \cap (x_h + \tau K)$ has width h in the direction $N(x)$. The following theorem is true also for non-symmetric K if we replace $K \cap (x_h + \tau K)$ by $K \cap (x_h - \tau K)$ and define x_h accordingly.

Theorem 3.1 *Let K be a symmetric convex body in $\mathbf{R}^n$ and x a normal point of ∂K . For every $\tau > 0$ the following formula gives the Gauss–Kronecker curvature $\kappa(x) = \kappa_K(x)$*

$$(1) \quad \kappa(x) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{c_n^{n+1} h^{n+1}}{\left(\frac{1+\tau}{\tau}\right)^{n-1} |K \cap (x_h + \tau K)|^2}$$

where $c_n = 2 \left(\frac{\omega_{n-1}}{n+1}\right)^{\frac{2}{n+1}}$ and ω_k is the volume of the k -dimensional Euclidean ball.

Remarks. a) It is proved in [L] (pp.450–454) that at a normal point x

$$(2) \quad \kappa(x) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{c_n^{n+1} h^{n+1}}{|K \cap H_h^+|^2}$$

where H_h is a hyperplane orthogonal to $N(x)$, H_h^+ -the half space containing x and bounded by H_h and the width of $K \cap H_h^+$ in direction $N(x)$ is h .

b) For $\tau = 1$ (1) is a result of [S-m].

Proof. *case a):* $\kappa(x) > 0$. The indicatrix of K at x is an ellipsoid E . We choose an orthogonal coordinate system $x_1, \dots, x_n$ in $\mathbf{R}^n$ in which $\mathbf{R}^{n-1} = \{e_n\}^\perp$ is parallel to the tangent hyperplane of K at x . Using a volume-preserving linear transformation which preserves $\mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, we may assume that $N(x)$ is parallel to x and that

$$E = \left\{ y \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}; \kappa(x)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j^2 \leq 1 \right\}$$

The indicatrix of τK at $-\tau x$ is $\sqrt{\tau}E$.

Let H_h and J_h be hyperplanes parallel to $\mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ at distances h and $\frac{\tau}{1+\tau}h$, respectively from x (then J_h is also of distance $\frac{1}{1+\tau}h$ from $x_h - \tau x$).

By the definition of the indicatrix, the following limit exists in the Hausdorff-distance sense, as $h \rightarrow 0$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2h}} P_{e_n}(K \cap H_h) \rightarrow E$$

From which follows

$$(3) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2h}} P_{e_n}(J_h \cap K) \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{1+\tau}} E$$

and by symmetry

$$(4) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2h}} P_{e_n}(J_h \cap (x_h + \tau K)) \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{1+\tau}} E$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} V(h) &= |K \cap (x_h + \tau K)| \\ V_1(h) &= |K \cap J_h^+| \\ V_2(h) &= |(x_h + \tau K) \cap J_h^-| \end{aligned}$$

From (3) and (4) we conclude

$$|V(h) - [V_1(h) + V_2(h)]| \leq h^{\frac{n+1}{2}} f(h)$$

where $f(h) \longrightarrow 0$ as $h \longrightarrow 0$. We get

$$(5) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{V(h)}{c_n^{\frac{n+1}{2}} h^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{V_1(h) + V_2(h)}{c_n^{\frac{n+1}{2}} h^{\frac{n+1}{2}}}$$

Using (5), the distance from J_h to x and to $x_h - \tau x$, (2), and the identity $\kappa_{\tau K}(-\tau x) = \frac{1}{\tau} \kappa(x)$ we get

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{V(h)}{c_n^{\frac{n+1}{2}} h^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} = \frac{\left(\frac{\tau}{1+\tau}\right)^{\frac{n+1}{2}}}{\sqrt{\kappa(x)}} + \frac{\left(\frac{1}{1+\tau}\right)^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \tau^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{\sqrt{\kappa(x)}} = \left(\frac{\tau}{1+\tau}\right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \kappa(x)^{-1/2}$$

which proves (1) in *case a*).

case b): $\kappa(x) = 0$. After an appropriate transformation, we may assume that the indicatrix E of K at x is of the form $E = E_{n-1-j} \times \mathbf{R}^j$ where

$$E_{n-1-j} = \left\{ y \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1-j}; k^{\frac{1}{n-1-j}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1-j} y_i^2 \leq 1 \right\}$$

For $\beta > 0$ let

$$S(h) = \{y \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}; -\beta\sqrt{2h} \leq y_i \leq \beta\sqrt{2h} \text{ for } i = n-j, \dots, n-1\}$$

Let J_h be as in *case a*) and

$$\begin{aligned} V(h) &= |K \cap (x_h + \tau K)| & W(h) &= |K \cap (x_h + \tau K) \cap S(h)| \\ W_1(h) &= |K \cap S(h) \cap J_h^+| & W_2(h) &= |(x_h + \tau K) \cap S(h) \cap J_h^-| \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of the indicatrix, $(1/\sqrt{2h})P_{e_n}(K \cap J_h)$ and $(1/\sqrt{2h})P_{e_n}((x_h + \tau K) \cap J_h)$ tend to infinity in the directions $(y_{n-j}, \dots, y_{n-1})$, as $h \longrightarrow 0$ and this limit is uniform in the subspace of $\mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ orthogonal to these directions. Also, $S(h)$ cuts the above projection sets, in these directions at $\pm\beta$ (when h is small enough). Therefore we get, like in *case a*):

$$|W(h) - [W_1(h) + W_2(h)]| \leq h^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \cdot o(1) \text{ as } h \longrightarrow 0.$$

hence

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{V(h)}{c_n^{\frac{n+1}{2}} h^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} &\geq \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{W(h)}{c_n^{\frac{n+1}{2}} h^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \\ &= \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{W_1(h) + W_2(h)}{c_n^{\frac{n+1}{2}} h^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \end{aligned}$$

As $h \rightarrow 0$ $W_1(h)$ is, up to terms of the form $o(h^{\frac{n+1}{2}})$, not less than

$$\beta^j |E_{n-1-j}| \int_0^{\frac{\tau}{1+\tau}} (2t)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} dt = \gamma h^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \beta^j$$

where γ does not depend on h or β (cf. the computation in [L] p.452). With similar estimate for $W_2(h)$ we get

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{V(h)}{c_n^{\frac{n+1}{2}} h^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \geq \gamma' \beta^j$$

Since this is true for all $\beta > 0$ case b) is proved. ■

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let K and τ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.1. Then for $0 < \delta < \min(1, \tau^n)|K|$, K is homothetic to $K(\delta, \tau)$. By Lemma 2.3 and Theorems 2.4 and 2.5, it follows that K is strictly convex with boundary of class $\mathcal{C}^2$.

The Gauss map $u \longleftrightarrow x(u)$ between $u \in S^{n-1}$ and the point $x(u) \in \partial K$ where the outer normal of K is u , is well defined and invertible. Using this map we can write the Gauss–Kronecker curvature of K as a function $\kappa(u)$ defined on S^{n-1} . In this notation, Theorem 3.1 is written:

$$(1) \quad \kappa(u) = \lim_{\lambda \nearrow 1} \frac{c_n^{n+1} (1 - \lambda)^{n+1} |\langle x(u), u \rangle|^{n+1}}{\left(\frac{1+\tau}{\tau}\right)^{n-1} |K \cap [(1 + \lambda)x(u) + \tau K]|^2}$$

Clearly $\langle x(u), u \rangle = \|u\|_{K^*}$. By the assumption, and since $\|x(u)\|_K = 1$, $|K \cap [(1 + \lambda)x(u) + \tau K]|$ depends on λ but not on u .

Let $f(u) = (1/\kappa(u)) = R_1 \cdot \dots \cdot R_{n-1}$ be the product of the principal radii of curvature of K at $x(u)$. We get

$$(2) \quad f(u) = \frac{k}{\|u\|_{K^*}^{n+1}}$$

for some constant k . By the Gauss–Bonnet formula, the constant k cannot be infinite hence $f(u)$ is finite everywhere and is a curvature function in the sense of being a derivative of the curvature measure of K (cf. [S-n]).

The following theorem was proved by Petty [P] (Lemma 8.4), using deep results of Pogorelov, Cheng and Yau and others

Theorem 4.1 (Petty) *Let K be a convex body in $\mathbf{R}^n$ with ∂K of class $\mathcal{C}^2$ and having a curvature function $f(u)$. If $f(u)$ satisfies (2) then K is an ellipsoid.*

Using Theorem 4.1, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is concluded. ■

Concluding remarks. *a)* We discussed here in the context of Theorem 1.1, only centrally symmetric convex bodies. The property of convex bodies which is assumed in Theorem 1.1 can be formulated for a-priori not necessarily symmetric bodies. One should specify then a point $0 \in \text{int } K$ to be the origin. For the case $\tau = 1$ it turns out that convex bodies which satisfy the assumption of Theorem 1.1 must be symmetric, hence, by our result, ellipsoids. Actually, it follows from Lemma (2.1) that such a convex body K must be homothetic to the polar of the projection body of K (cf. also [S-m] Theorem 1).

b) Remark *a)* above brings one back to the well known problem of Busemann: If for $n \geq 3$, a convex body K in $\mathbf{R}^n$ is homothetic to the polar of its projection body, must K be an ellipsoid? A positive answer to this problem would give another solution to the problem which is solved in this paper (for $\tau = 1$ and $n \geq 3$) by using the assumption $|K \cap (x + K)| = f(\|x\|_K)$ only for small translations x . Our proof uses this assumption only for ‘large’ translations, i. e. vectors x such that $\|x\|_K$ is close to 2.

In fact, one can ask whether the following property characterizes ellipsoids: *For one fixed $0 < \alpha < 1 + \tau$, $|K \cap (x + \tau K)|$ is constant for $\|x\|_K = \alpha$.*

c) The case $\tau = \infty$, i. e. assumption on the volumes of sections of K by hyperplanes in all directions can be proved along the same lines of the proof of Theorem 1.1, using floating bodies instead of convolution bodies. A very simple proof of this case is given however in [M-R-1] (Lemma 3) (though the proof here has the slight advantage of using the assumption only ‘near the boundary’ of K).

d) A weaker result concerning the problem treated in this paper had been proved before by Y. Gordon and M. Meyer (unpublished). They proved that if for every $\tau > 0$, $|K \cap (x + \tau K)|$ depends only on $\|x\|_K$, then K is an ellipsoid.

References

- [B] B. Bollobás, *Area of the union of disks*, Elem. d. Math. **23** (1968), 60–61.
- [B-L] I. Barany and D. G. Larman, *Convex bodies, economic cap coverings, random polytopes*, Mathematika **35** (1988), 274–291.
- [C-P] V. Capoteas and J. Pach, *On the perimeter of a point set in the plane*
- [Go] Y. Gordon, *Majorization of Gaussian processes and geometric applications*, Probability Th. and Related Fields (1992), to appear.
- [Gr] M. Gromov, *Monotonicity of the volume of intersection of balls*, ‘Geometrical Aspects of Functional Analysis’, Lecture Notes in Math. ,Springer Verlag, Berlin **1267** (1987), 1–4.
- [H] H. Hadwiger, *Ungelöste Probleme No. 11*, Elem. d. Math. **11** (1956), 60–61.
- [K] M. Kneser, *Einige Bemerkungen über das Minkowskische Flächenmass*, Arch. Math. **6** (1955), 382–390.
- [L] K. Leichtweiss, *Zur Affinoberfläche konvexer Körper*, Manuscr. Math. **56** (1986) 429–464.
- [M] A. M. Macbeath, *A theorem on non-homogeneous lattices*, Annals of Math. **56** (1952), 269–293.
- [M-R-1] M. Meyer and S. Reisner, *Characterizations of ellipsoids by section-centroid location*, Geom. Ded. **31** (1989), 345–355.
- [M-R-2] M. Meyer and S. Reisner, *A geometric property of the boundary of symmetric convex bodies and convexity of flotation surfaces*, Geom. Ded. **37** (1991), 327–337.
- [P] C. M. Petty, *Affine isoperimetric problems*, ‘Discrete Geometry and Convexity’, Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **440** (1985), 113–127.

- [S-m] M. Schmuckenschläger, *The distribution function of the convolution square of a convex symmetric body in $\mathbf{R}^n$* , Israel J. Math. to appear.
- [S-n] R. Schneider, *Boundary structure and curvature of convex bodies*, Proc. Geom. Symp. Siegen 1978, eds. J. Tölke and J. Wills, 13–59.
- [TP] E. Thue Poulsen, *Problem 10*, Math. Scand. **2** (1954), 346.